

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 10, 13 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chaudhuri et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,223,171) in view of Lohman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,356,889). In response, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants incorporated the features of claim 4 into the independent claims, and respectfully traverse the rejection because neither Chaudhuri nor Lohman discloses or suggests managing data of a number of accesses, a generation date and time, and an update frequency of a dynamically generated index.

On page 5, second paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Chaudhuri '171 teaches managing data of the number of accesses, a generation date and time, and an update frequency of dynamically generated index in FIGs. 8-13. FIG. 8 illustrates an exemplary user interface produced by performing a summary analysis for use by a database administrator. More particularly, FIG. 8 illustrates the relative frequency of usage of indexes in an existing configuration. FIG. 8 at least does not show data of a generation date and time being managed. FIG. 9 is a flow chart showing summary analysis of analysis data generated using a hypothetical configuration simulation. FIG. 9 teaches determining a class of analysis such as a workload analysis, configuration analysis, or a cost in index usage analysis (See step 902). Objects to be analyzed are identified in step 904. Filtering of the objects occurs in step 906, and partitioning of the objects occurs in step 908. Step 910 associates a measure with the

objects and ranks or summarizes the objects. However, FIG. 9 is silent regarding managing data of a generation date and time.

Similarly, FIGs. 10-12 also fail to disclose or suggest at least managing data of a generation date and time for indexes. FIG. 10 is merely a tabulation of the distribution of selection conditions on orders. FIG. 11 shows a distribution of multi-column indexes by table. FIG. 12 shows partitioning indexes in a configuration by width. None of these figures show management of data of a generation date and time of a dynamically generated index, and Applicants can find no support in Chaudhuri '171 or Lohman for teaching this feature. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-3, 5-9, 11-12, and 14-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lohman in view of one or more of Chaudhuri et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,196,983), Smith et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,404,510), and Chaudhuri '171. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the reasons recited above with respect to the §103(a) rejection of claims 1, 4, 10, 13 and 16.

The deficiencies of Chaudhuri '171 and Lohman are discussed above. Chaudhuri '983 fails to disclose or suggest managing data of a generation date and time of a dynamically generated index. Smith is also silent regarding this feature. Accordingly, any combination of these references with Lohman fails to disclose or suggest the feature now recited in the amended independent claims. For this reason,


Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 2-3, 5-9, 11-12, and 14-15.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that this Application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By


Joseph P. Fox
Registration No. 41,760

August 30, 2007
300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080
Customer No. 24978